

## **General Disclaimer**

### **One or more of the Following Statements may affect this Document**

- This document has been reproduced from the best copy furnished by the organizational source. It is being released in the interest of making available as much information as possible.
- This document may contain data, which exceeds the sheet parameters. It was furnished in this condition by the organizational source and is the best copy available.
- This document may contain tone-on-tone or color graphs, charts and/or pictures, which have been reproduced in black and white.
- This document is paginated as submitted by the original source.
- Portions of this document are not fully legible due to the historical nature of some of the material. However, it is the best reproduction available from the original submission.

E82-10390  
CTR-169179

1. Introduction

Title of investigation: Spherical harmonic representation of the main  
geomagnetic field for world charting and  
investigations of some fundamental problems of  
physics and geophysics

Investigators: D R Barraclough, Institute of Geological Sciences  
R Hide, Meteorological Office  
B R Leaton, Institute of Geological Sciences (now retired)  
F J Lowes, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne  
S R C Malin, Institute of Geological Sciences  
R L Wilson, University of Liverpool

Progress Report - June 1st 1982

RECEIVED

JUN 29, 1982

SIS/9026

M-037

TYPE II



(E82-10390) SPHERICAL HARMONIC  
REPRESENTATION OF THE MAIN GEOMAGNETIC FIELD  
FOR WORLD CHARTING AND INVESTIGATIONS OF  
SOME FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS OF PHYSICS AND  
GEOPHYSICS (Institute of Geological

682-32812

HC A03

Unclas  
G3/43 00390

"Made available under NASA sponsorship  
in the interest of early and wide dis-  
semination of Earth Resources Survey  
Program information and without liability  
for any use made therefrom."

Analyses of the MAGSAT data at Liverpool University Geophysics Department

From the investigator B tapes we have extracted one day's worth of measurements about every seven days from and including 5th November to 10th January. Each of these single-day data sets was subdivided into information on the sunset side of the Earth only, and again on the sunrise side. For any given day we therefore have two data sets which cover the entire surface of the Earth quite well but correspond to one of the two terminators. Our purpose was to do harmonic analyses of the separate data sets for the same day, so as to see whether there were any difference between the two sets of results.

In the event, there is a very clear and consistent difference between the sets of data.  $g_1^0$  for the main field differs systematically and in the same sense by about 5 nanoTesla from one terminator to the other. Since both data sets for any one day cover the entire Earth, it follows that any difference between them must be due to ionospheric currents which differ from the sunset to the sunrise terminator.  $g_1^0$  for the external field shows even greater systematic differences averaging about 10 or 12 nanoTesla, again always with the same sense of difference.

We have analysed for a toroidal field which was the original object of our pursuit, and find that the toroidal field differs from one terminator to the other by about 15 nanoTesla on the average and always with the same sign, with one exception. These data have been "corrected" for a yaw error, which turns out to be mathematically equivalent to the  $g_1^0$  coefficient of a toroidal field. Since the apparent toroidal fields in sunrise and sunset terminators disagree by very significant amounts, it follows that a constant yaw error cannot explain these results. Neither can a toroidal field explain the results. We must be looking at an apparent toroidal field which results from electric currents concentrated in the two terminators. These apparent toroidal fields do not agree with each other because the current systems in the two terminators do not produce apparent east-west fields (toroidal) of the same sign and magnitude.

It follows that the yaw error which has been corrected for is in great doubt, and very likely really corresponds to ionospheric current effects which exist in the two terminators and which do not average to zero when the information from the two terminators is mixed together.

We are continuing to pursue these analyses forward in time.

Our analyses have been carried out several times on each data set so as to progressively eliminate data which deviate from that of a smoothly fitting 14th degree analysis. The final data set in each case contains no data point

which deviates more than 20 nanoTesla from the 14th degree analysis. This turns out empirically to eliminate data from the circular auroral zones in the northern and southern hemispheres, without rejecting data from near the poles arbitrarily. The progressive elimination of these auroral zone data points demonstrates that the information we are presenting in this report does not arise from complications due to Birkeland currents.